Case 1:06-cr-00150-JSR Document 161 Filed 02/02/15 Page 1 of 54

F1N9MATH UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 06 CR 150-07 (JSR) V. 5 MICHAEL MATERASSO, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. January 23, 2015 9 10:08 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. JED S. RAKOFF, 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 PREET BHARARA 16 United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 17 ANDREW BEATY DANIEL TEHRANI 18 Assistant United States Attorneys 19 SEWARD & KISSEL LLP Attorney for Defendant 20 RITA GLAVIN BRIAN P. MALONEY 21 ALSO PRESENT: CORINE VAN DRIMMELEN, Dutch Interpreter 22 23 24 25

(Case called) 1 2 (Hearing resumed) NADIJA NEZIROVIC, resumed 3 4 THE COURT: Please be seated. Let me thank our 5 witness for being back here. 6 That's to be interpreted. 7 I said I want to thank our witness for being back 8 here. 9 THE WITNESS: Okay. 10 THE COURT: So, Ms. Glavin, you're first. 11 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. GLAVIN: 12 13 Q. Ms. Nezirovic, you were visiting Irma and Michael in 14 October; is that correct? 15 A. Yes. Q. And at some point during that visit Irma was very angry 16 with Michael; isn't that right? 17 A. Yes. She was angry with Michael. Especially that one time 18 19 she was very angry. 20 Q. She was angry with him because she thought he was cheating 21 on her, right? 22 MR. BEATY: Objection, your Honor. Hearsay. 23 THE COURT: Well I think it's relevant background 24 to -- it's not being offered for its truth. It's also, I 25 believe, undisputed, not that that would erase the hearsay

Nezirovic - cross

- 1 objection. But I don't see -- I think what you're inquiring 2 about is her understanding, the witness's understanding of why 3 Irma was mad at Michael, yes?
 - MS. GLAVIN: I can rephrase it better, I suppose.
- THE COURT: All right. 5
- BY MS. GLAVIN: 6

4

7

8

13

14

- Q. You understood that Irma was angry with Michael because Michael was cheating on her, right?
- 9 Irma was very angry with Michael. Because she went to the 10 bank and found out where Michael had spent money. And then she 11 went to the place where he had spent the money which was a spa 12 and found out he had been there with someone else. And that's
 - And she told you about this, correct? Q.

why she was very angry with him at the time.

- 15 As soon as she came back from the bank and the spa, when she came back she told me that he had spent a lot of money 16 17 there and that he was with someone there.
- 18 Q. This was the day before you left for Holland; isn't that 19 right?
- 20 Α. No.
- 21 Q. When was it?
- 22 It was a few days before I left.
- 23 Did you know -- were you at the apartment when Irma confronted Michael with those bank statements? 24
- 25 I was home with the baby and she went to bring Gia to

Nezirovic - cross

- school and then after that she came home from the bank. 1
- 2 That was not my question. Please listen carefully to my
- 3 question. Okay.
- Okay. 4 Α.
- 5 Q. You were at the apartment when Irma confronted Michael
- about the bank statements, correct? 6
- 7 That's correct.
- 8 She was furious; is that right?
- I heard a fight going on in the bedroom when he came home 9
- 10 from work.
- 11 She was yelling at him; is that right?
- 12 Α. Yes.
- 13 He didn't hit her, did he? 0.
- 14 I did not see it. I was in the living room. Α.
- 15 Q. Well she didn't tell you he hit her, did she?
- Objection, your Honor. 16 MR. BEATY:
- 17 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 18 THE WITNESS: After the fight she went, took the
- 19 children to the playroom.
- 20 THE COURT: No. The question is did you see any
- 21 evidence or hear any evidence of physical fighting as opposed
- 22 to verbal fighting?
- 23 THE WITNESS: No. I did not see it.
- 24 I only heard them scream at each other in the bedroom.
- 25 You were angry with Michael because you believe he

F1N9MATH

Nezirovic - cross

- mistreated your daughter; is that right? 1
- 2 I was not angry with Michael and I'm still not angry with
- Michael. But I am worried about my daughter. I see how she 3
- lives and I heard about how things are going. But now I 4
- 5 actually saw it, witnessed it firsthand.
- 6 When you say you heard about what was happening, you heard
- 7 about what was happening from your daughter; is that right?
- 8 I heard them both screaming at each other.
- Q. Has your daughter told you about bad things Michael has 9
- 10 done to her?
- Not until later, until she went to the shelter. I heard 11
- 12 many things about her life with him.
- 13 From her; is that right? 0.
- 14 From her. Α.
- And after Irma went to the shelter she was Skyping with you 15 Q.
- and e-mailing with you; is that right? 16
- 17 I did not see her via Skype but she did send some pictures
- of the children. 18
- 19 So, from November 8 until now you have not Skyped with your
- 20 daughter?
- 21 I Skyped with her when she was back in the apartment. Α.
- 22 Would that be in December of 2014. Last month?
- 23 Α. I think so.
- And you understood from your daughter, Irma, that Irma was 24
- 25 not happy with Donna Materasso, didn't you?

Nezirovic - cross

- A. I want to ask for clarification about the question. Was

 she happy with Donna before she left to go to the shelter or
- 3 after?
- 4 | Q. I'm talking about in December of 2014, last month.
- 5 | A. Okay.
- 6 Q. Do you understand?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Irma told you she was not happy with Donna; isn't that
- 9 || right?
- 10 A. I heard from her that she wasn't happy that Donna had given
- 11 some money but it wasn't the entire amount and the money came
- 12 | from her job or from Michael and it wasn't the entire amount
- 13 | for her and the children.
- 14 | Q. Irma helped you -- withdrawn.
- 15 Last month Irma helped you write an e-mail to Donna;
- 16 | isn't that right?
- 17 A. No. Never happened.
- 18 | Q. You sent an e-mail to Donna on December 17 of 2014; isn't
- 19 | that right?
- 20 | A. I have sent her mail quite often. I don't know which mail
- 21 | you're referring to.
- 22 | Q. Did Irma help you write any of the e-mails you sent to
- 23 Donna?
- 24 MR. BEATY: Asked and answered, your Honor.
- 25 THE WITNESS: No. No.

25

Nezirovic - cross THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on. 1 2 What was the objection? MR. BEATY: Asked and answered. 3 4 THE COURT: Overruled. MS. GLAVIN: Repeat the answer. 5 6 THE WITNESS: No. 7 Showing you what is Defendant's Exhibit 44. This is an e-mail you sent for Donna and it's in English; is that right? 8 9 A. Yes. 10 MS. GLAVIN: With the assistance of the interpreter. 11 Didn't you tell Donna in this e-mail: Do you even ask 12 yourself how she is making it by in the meantime financially? 13 She has sold everything she could. Her TV, phones, and even 14 her clothes that were worth anything. 15 Didn't you say that to Donna in this e-mail? MR. BEATY: Objection as to relevance, your Honor. 16 17 THE WITNESS: That she sold her clothes and. 18 THE COURT: Overruled. 19 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yes. 20 MS. GLAVIN: Can we have Court Exhibit A, B, and C. 21 BY MS. GLAVIN: 22 Q. Now, on Tuesday you remember testifying for the first time 23 in this courtroom, right -- no. Was it Tuesday?

You've testified in this courtroom two previous days; is that right?

F1N9MATH

Α. Yes.

1

5

6

2 The first day that you testified you remember I was 0. questioning you and we had to stop for the day, right? 3

4 THE INTERPRETER: Okay. Let me rephrase.

THE WITNESS: So what is the question?

- Q. Do you remember after the first --
- 7 THE COURT: I think that was a good response because it didn't sound like a question. It sounded like a statement. 8
- BY MS. GLAVIN: 9
- 10 Q. You went home after the first day you testified; is that 11 right -- withdrawn.
- You went to Irma's apartment after the first day you 12 13 testified; is that right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And you went to Irma's apartment and you took pictures; is 16 that right?
- 17 A. Yes.

20

21

18 Q. And the pictures that you took that night you sent to the Child Protection Services people, correct? 19

MR. BEATY: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: You can't do that.

- 22 BY MS. GLAVIN:
- 23 To Mr. Beaty; is that correct?
- 24 Α. Yes. That is correct.
- 25 Looking at what is Court Exhibit B. That's the photo you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

took, right?

Objection, your Honor, as beyond the scope MR. BEATY: of this examination.

THE COURT: I'm going to give some leeway here.

THE WITNESS: Yes. The photo I took.

- You see a TV in the mirror; is that correct? 0.
- The television is next to the mirror. Α.
- And Court Exhibit C, that's the photo you took and sent to
- Mr. Beaty; is that right? 9
- 10 Yes. Because I didn't understand -- I took the pictures
- 11 because the map of the apartment was not clear to me and to get
- 12 a better understanding I took the pictures so -- to show you
- 13 where I was and what I could see from where I was.
- 14 Q. Let me ask the question again. Court Exhibit No. C is a
- 15 picture you took and sent to Andrew Beaty, yes or no?
- I only know those two people and he was the one I sent it 16
- 17 to and he was the only one.
- 18 Q. So you took the picture, Court Exhibit C, you took that
- 19 picture? Yes?
- 20 A. You don't have to scream at me. There's so much going on
- 21 with my daughter, the children. Please don't scream at me.
- 22 THE COURT: Well I agree with that. I think,
- 23 Ms. Glavin, you've got to lower the temperature a little.
- 24 However, the -- just so that I'm clear Ms. Nezirovic, did
- 25 you -- were you the one who took that picture, that photograph?

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 THE COURT: Okay.

BY MS. GLAVIN:

3

4

- And you took the photograph this week, right? Q.
- 5 A. Yes. The evening after I was here. When I saw the apartment, the map and I don't know if it was the first or 6
- 7 second day.
- 8 Q. Looking at Court Exhibit C, can you point out to us where
- the TV is. Point out where the TV is? 9
- 10 A. You're screaming at me so I don't want to answer. I'm here
- 11 to explain what I have seen and done and so you don't have to
- 12 scream at me.
- 13 THE COURT: I have to agree with the witness,
- 14 Ms. Glavin, that you need to lower the temperature.
- BY MS. GLAVIN: 15
- 16 Q. Please point out --
- 17 THE COURT: Excuse me now. The question, however, is 18 would you point out where the TV is.
- THE WITNESS: The TV is here. 19
- 20 THE COURT: Indicating towards the far left of the
- 21 photo beside the bookcase.
- 22 THE WITNESS: The television is here. Here is the
- 23 corner and here is the TV.
- 24 Q. And you can see the reflection of the TV in the window; is
- 25 that right?

1 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

MS. GLAVIN: I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BEATY: Brief redirect, your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BEATY:

Q. Ms. Nezirovic do you see Defendant's Exhibit 44 in front of you? Do you still have that in front of you?

Is it your understanding that that e-mail was written by your son, Damir?

MS. GLAVIN: Objection.

THE COURT: Ground.

MS. GLAVIN: I'm still thinking of that.

THE COURT: Pardon.

MS. GLAVIN: I'm still thinking. Foundation.

THE COURT: That won't do it. Leading would do it.

MS. GLAVIN: Leading.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BEATY:

Q. Ms. Nezirovic do you remember testifying on direct

21 | examination that you wrote that e-mail with the help of your

son, Damir?

MS. GLAVIN: Same objection.

24 THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: No. I'll allow that as foundational to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- the question you're hopefully about to put.
- Did Irma help you write that e-mail? 0.
 - She never helped me to compose any e-mails. I am not crazy. I'm not -- I can read and write. And she never helped me. And I know exactly all -- the content of the e-mails that I sent to Donna.

THE COURT: I have a few questions. Forgive me, counsel.

So my recollection, correct me if I have this wrong, is you prepared this e-mail but your English wasn't good enough and so you asked your son to translate it and put it into better English. Do I have that right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you know whether your son was in communication with Irma during that process.

THE WITNESS: Can I explain how we have -- how we have composed this e-mail?

THE COURT: Of course.

THE WITNESS: My son called me very early in the morning or in the middle of the night. It was about 3:30 a.m. or 4 o'clock. I was still in bed. And he told me that Irma had called him to ask to speak to Ms. Donna to talk about her situation. I told him that he could not bother Donna, that it is not your business. I told him I will send -- try to make an e-mail and -- or send a message was the literal words -- send a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

message to Donna because I knew what Irma needed to speak to -my son told me what Irma needed to speak to Donna about.

I told him can you make a message and I did not go downstairs yet. It was cold and I had a headache. And on my telephone -- through my telephone I told him what the content of the message should be. And he wrote everything down.

I went downstairs later and I got on the computer and there I saw there was a message from Irma and I was surprised that I wanted to -- that I received a message from Irma.

And then I checked through Google Translate what the message said. Everything was correct that I told my son he should write a message to Donna. So I did make a copy of the text and I sent it to Donna.

THE COURT: So I'm a little unclear about one thing. The message you got from Irma was about -- was her telling you her ideas for the message you should send to Donna?

THE WITNESS: I told my son that he should make a message for Donna. And the message should be sent from me. On behalf of me.

THE COURT: I thought -- I'm sorry. Go ahead. thought you just said -- maybe I misunderstood -- that before that was finished you received a message, was it from Irma?

THE WITNESS: I just received a message from Irma with the content, without text from her.

THE COURT: I don't understand that. Explain it

1 again.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: When I was at the computer I saw the message from Irma.

THE COURT: What was the message from Irma?

THE WITNESS: That this was the message.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. You're looking at Exhibit 44, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: And that's a message from you to Donna, is it not?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Later I heard from my son and I asked him why did you send it to Irma? I wanted to send it to Donna.

THE COURT: So your son sent it to Irma?

THE WITNESS: Yes. He sent it to Irma because to keep her quiet. She was starting to panic because the electricity was going to cut off and she couldn't live in a dark apartment.

THE COURT: So then what did she send to you? What did Irma send to you?

THE WITNESS: Just the message she received from my son.

THE COURT: Why would she send that to you?

THE WITNESS: The contents of the message was for me not for her.

All the messages I sent to Donna I also sent to Irma

F1N9MATH

25

Nezirovic - redirect

because I wanted to keep her from panicking, to keep her quiet, 1 2 and because she had been in a fight with Donna. 3 THE COURT: Did Irma have access to using your e-mail? 4 THE WITNESS: No. 5 THE COURT: So, you have just the one e-mail address, one e-mail that you use which is N dot Nadija at Gmail dot com? 6 7 THE WITNESS: Yes. 8 THE COURT: Let me show you page two of Exhibit 45 and look at the -- the interpreter, if necessary, can help you with 9 10 the translation. But I'm really only interested in the first 11 few lines of that page. 12 THE INTERPRETER: I did the first five, six lines. 13 THE COURT: My question first is so this is an e-mail you also sent to Donna on December 17, 2014, yes? 14 15 THE WITNESS: If that's what it says then, yes that's 16 correct. 17 THE COURT: You're familiar with the fact that when 18 you send or receive an e-mail the time is stamped, yes? 19 THE WITNESS: Yes. 20 THE COURT: So -- are you familiar on your own Gmail 21 as to the -- how the time appears, what the format is? 22 THE WITNESS: Yes. 23 THE COURT: So if you look at the top here it says 24 2014-12-17. That means December 17, 2014, yes?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

1	THE COURT: Correct?
2	THE WITNESS: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Then it says 9:34 GMT plus 01:00. That
4	means that it's 9:34 Holland time because Holland time is one
5	hour different from English time?
6	THE WITNESS: At night, one?
7	THE COURT: So GMT do you know whether GMT stands
8	for Greenwich Mean Time which is the time in Greenwich,
9	England?
10	THE WITNESS: It's 1 o'clock in the morning?
11	THE INTERPRETER: Am I allowed to explain?
12	THE COURT: Let me try. You see the 9:34?
13	THE WITNESS: Yes.
14	THE COURT: So that's the time in the Netherlands when
15	you sent the e-mail according to this.
16	Do you understand?
17	THE WITNESS: Yes. If that's what it says that's
18	correct.
19	THE COURT: But are you familiar that on your own
20	e-mail that there's this notation? Have you seen this kind of
21	notation on your own e-mails?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	THE COURT: Are you familiar with the fact that when
24	it is 9 o'clock in the Netherlands it's 8o'clock in England?
25	THE WITNESS: The time goes back? Or forward?

1 THE COURT: I'm sorry. 2 THE WITNESS: The time goes back an hour? Or it goes forward? 3 4 THE COURT: Because the time is, in the Netherlands, 5 is one hour earlier than the time in England. If you know. I'm just asking if you're familiar with that. 6 7 THE WITNESS: No. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Do you remember sending this e-mail, the one on page two of Exhibit 45? 9 THE WITNESS: Yes. Very well. 10 11 THE COURT: And turn to first page of the exhibit. 12 There's an e-mail also sent on December 17, also sent from you 13 to Donna, yes? 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. 15 THE COURT: And do you recollect that's another e-mail 16 vou sent? 17 THE WITNESS: Yes. Irma had told me that Michael will 18 get out of jail with some bail money. 19 THE COURT: Now these e-mails, the two that we were 20 just looking at, you wrote but used Google Translate to turn 21

them into English; is that right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All of these e-mails were because you did not want Michael to get out of jail, yes?

THE WITNESS: Irma was afraid of him and so when he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gets out of jail again she was again afraid. And I also was worried because I am afraid he can be dangerous.

THE COURT: So throughout the morning and into later in the day on December 17 you were receiving constant updates from Irma as to what was going on; is that fair?

THE WITNESS: I -- we called each other a lot. We constantly were on the phone, during the day, in the middle of the night. She was very emotional and upset. And I just wanted to speak to her.

THE COURT: Then let me ask you one last time, because we've sort of been over this but I just want to be absolutely clear. With respect to Exhibit 65.

THE INTERPRETER: 45, your Honor.

MR. BEATY: Your Honor, I don't believe that exhibit has been shown to the witness.

THE COURT: What is the one down there?

THE INTERPRETER: 44.

THE COURT: Well let me show you 65.

So that's the e-mail from Irma to you with the very same language of your e-mail in Exhibit 44 to Donna.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: And every indication is that that was sent to you, and I think you also testified, sent to you by Irma before you sent the very same e-mail to Donna, true?

THE WITNESS: No. But when Irma sent this to me I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

checked it through Google Translate. And once I checked it, I -- my son had written it, and then I sent it to Donna.

THE COURT: Right. So do you have any understanding why your daughter Irma was sending you the text of the e-mail you were going to shortly thereafter send to Donna?

THE WITNESS: I did not understand why my son sent the e-mail to Irma instead of Donna and the e-mail should have gone to Donna directly, not to Irma. Later when I spoke to my son he told me why he had sent the e-mail to Irma, because he wanted her to quiet down and not be so panicked at the time.

THE COURT: Right. But why is she sending it back to you?

THE WITNESS: Because it wasn't for her. The mail was not meant for her. The mail was meant for Donna and she sent it back to me. She wanted me to know.

THE COURT: To know what?

THE WITNESS: We always sent -- I always sent the mails also to Irma so she knew that I was in contact with Donna.

THE COURT: Were you talking with her on the phone at the same time this was going on involving these various exchanges of e-mails that we've been looking at?

THE WITNESS: Irma and I talked a lot over the phone. And we talked about the fact that she had trouble paying for school for Gia, and for her electricity, and for television and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that's why -- television I think meaning cable -- and that's why we spoke a lot. And we did not speak about -- always speak about my contact with Donna and what I said to her in the That's why I asked Donna to get some financial support from them because I cannot pay for everything for Irma.

THE COURT: This e-mail exchange that you had with Donna and that your son drafted, this was very early in the morning I think you said.

I slept very poorly the entire THE WITNESS: Yes. time, the entire two months. And my mobile telephone is always next to my bed.

THE COURT: So when Donna -- excuse me. When Irma sent you the e-mail back to you that she had received from your son -- let me rephrase this question.

When Irma sent you the e-mail with the very same text that you were then going to send to Donna, wasn't it your understanding that she was saying that she approved the sending of that e-mail?

THE WITNESS: I think that Irma sent me the message because she understood that the mail was supposed to be sent to Donna and not to her. So she always got e-mails from me but never from my son.

THE COURT: Are you saying she sent it to you to show you what she had received from her son?

THE WITNESS: I just made a copy and sent it to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ms. Donna and I don't recall.

All the mails that I have sent to Donna I also sent to Irma because I wanted Irma to know that Donna was not angry with her and I wanted them to have a good relationship and not fight over anything, so --

THE COURT: That's not really what I was asking about. But all right. Counsel, go ahead.

MR. BEATY: One moment, please, your Honor.

(Pause)

No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MS. GLAVIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you so much. You may step down.

(Witness excused)

THE COURT: My understanding is that counsel decided late yesterday that they would prefer to give oral summations today rather than written summations; is that correct?

MR. BEATY: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. GLAVIN: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, is the government ready to go or shall we -- do you want a short break since there was a little extra testimony?

> MR. BEATY: Short break would be appreciated.

> THE COURT: So we'll take a ten-minute break.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

F1N9MATH

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

How long roughly are you going to be on your summation?

MR. BEATY: No more than 20 minutes.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Recess)

MR. BEATY: May it please the Court, the government has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that Michael Materasso unlawfully restrained his wife in violation of New York law.

This case is ultimately about whether you believe Nadija Nezirovic or Michael Materasso. This case is not about It's not about ACS. It's not about a wide-ranging conspiracy. It's about whether you believe the testimony of Ms. Nezirovic, a 61-year-old former social worker, about what she observed on November 5.

Now the specification at issue charges the defendant with unlawful imprisonment. To prove a violation of that under New York Penal Law Section 135.05 the government must establish simply that the defendant restrained another person. statute defines restrain to mean to restrict a person's movement intentionally and unlawfully in such a manner as to interfere substantially with his liberty by confining him without consent and with knowledge that the restriction is unlawful. A person is so confined without consent when it's accomplished by physical force, intimidation or deception.

The evidence in the record demonstrates that the defendant did so by tying up Irma Materasso nearly naked to a chair. Ms. Nezirovic testified that she was woken up on the morning of November 5 by the sounds of the defendant's voice in the living room. She admits that she didn't understand what he was saying. But he was talking loudly. It was early in the morning before the sun came up. She left her bedroom and in the living room she saw her daughter topless, seated on her chair, with her arms behind her back. The defendant was standing next to the chair fully clothed. After Ms. Nezirovic asked what was going on, Mr. Materasso looked at her very angrily and then leaned down to untie a rope. And it was at that moment when Ms. Nezirovic realized that her daughter's hands were, in fact, tied behind her back. Then the defendant got his coat from the closet and left the apartment.

You could tell by Ms. Nezirovic's demeanor that she was telling the truth. It was clearly painful for her to talk about. When your Honor was asking her detailed questions about the event that morning she got a little emotional.

You can tell she was telling the truth by the details she remembered as well as the things that she frankly admitted she didn't know or can't remember. She remembers what Irma was wearing and what she wasn't wearing. She remembers what she and Irma did next. But she candidly admitted that she doesn't know certain details like what kind of rope Irma's hands were

tied with.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And her testimony is corroborated in small ways that she couldn't have known would come into evidence. She testified that Irma and Michael had argued about bank statements about a spa. She said that argument took place in the bedroom. The defendant said the same thing on the stand.

Ms. Nezirovic testified that the defendant came home late one night and tried to get in but that Irma wouldn't let him in. Instead, Irma blockaded the door with chairs and with the children's stroller. The defendant testified that he came home late that night after being out with friends and he got locked out.

As Ms. Nezirovic testified the next day the defendant didn't go to work. Instead, she says he spent the next several days sleeping late at the apartment. She didn't say she knew why the defendant was sleeping. The government's theory about why he was sleeping is he was crashing after going on a meth binge. But the testimony that he was home and not working those days is corroborated by Probation Officer Olivares who testified about the absence of paystubs. And it's corroborated by the defendant himself who told you that he didn't go to work those days.

Ms. Nezirovic's testimony is corroborated about the February 2013 incident. She told the Court that she went back to Irma and Michael's house after walking the dog. And she saw

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a scene of Michael standing over Irma while Irma cried on the The window was completely broken and there was glass couch. all over the couch and the floor. She didn't know that Donna Materasso was going to corroborate that. She didn't know that Michael Materasso was going to admit it. And, in fact, she didn't even tell you that she saw the defendant do anything. She just told you what she observed when she got back from walking the dog.

But then Donna Materasso did get on the stand and corroborate that that incident happened. And the defendant did admit that he kicked a plastic chair through the window. And importantly her testimony is corroborated by the fact that Irma took her daughters and left the apartment that day to go to a domestic violence shelter.

If Irma simply wanted to get away from Michael she could have gone to stay with Michael's parents, stay with a friend, or even in a hotel. She didn't. Instead, she packed up all their things and went to stay in a shelter for six days.

Think about all of the things that Ms. Nezirovic could have embellished to make her testimony more dramatic. But she didn't. For one, why would this be the story she chose to make up? Why not make it more compelling? More abusive? More violent? She just told you what she saw.

And even with this incident she didn't tell you that as soon as Michael left she spent hours consoling Irma and then

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

immediately took her to a shelter. She told you what happened. That Irma was distraught and Irma went back to her bedroom to Irma stayed there a while. Ms. Nezirovic had a cup The two of them later took Jack the Pit Bull to a of coffee. groomer. This is not an embellished story, your Honor.

There was a lot of testimony about Ms. Nezirovic's understanding of floor plans and placement of hutches. This is a nonissue. It's not in dispute that Ms. Nezirovic knows the layout of the apartment or that she was actually staying there that night. In fact she's staying at that apartment right now.

The question is not whether she had a good view of what happened the morning of November 5 or whether she could see it from the right angle. The question is whether you believe it happened at all.

The only evidence in the record that this didn't happen is Michael Materasso's testimony. This is a man who has violated the Court's orders on four different occasions. admitted to lying to his probation officer on numerous occasions, essentially lying to the Court. And, in fact, he did lie to the Court. He got on the stand and he lied.

He was asked specific questions about doing drugs, the timeframe, where it might have happened, the type of drug. submit you don't simply forget using cocaine at a specific event, at a friend's wedding, just over a week after getting out of prison. And he only admitted that he lied to the Court

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

after he was confronted with the evidence.

This is what the defendant does. He denies what he cannot admit and admits what he cannot deny. He claims that he didn't do drugs at any other time during his supervised release other than the two times he initially admitted and then the third time he was forced to admit. But I submit you can't credit that testimony either.

In addition to the admitted drug use, the defendant's drug testing record, Government Exhibit 5, is perfectly consistent with someone who is using drugs and trying to skip out on drug tests when he knows that he'll test positive. failed to show up for a random drug test on October 2. He claims now on the stand that Mr. Olivares told him there was no drug testing that day. But Olivares didn't testify to that. And the drug test history indicates a missed test. And he didn't have a make-up test until five days later. That test was negative. The defendant rescheduled a test on October 27. And then when he was tested three days later the sample was diluted. Mr. Olivares testified that people dilute their urine in order to test negative.

The defendant has previously relied on a defense before your Honor that his threatening behavior was a product of his drug use. Given his admitted drug use and the strong implication that he was using throughout this term of supervised release, I submit that the drug use helps explain

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the many arguments that Ms. Nezirovic says she observed and it helps explain Irma's fear of him which her mother observed when she saw Irma blockading the door to their apartment. It helps explain the days the defendant spends sleeping in after not having come home for a few days.

The defense's theory is that the defendant is the victim of an international conspiracy to kidnap children, obstruct justice, and commit perjury. The defense is arguing that Ms. Nezirovic is lying on behalf of her daughter, but there is no evidence to back that up. She has no motive to lie, to travel from the Netherlands to the United States in order to commit perjury. If Irma and her mother simply wanted to spirit the children away --

THE COURT: I need to interrupt on just that point because I -- something that's not in evidence but I think I can fairly ask it, and I should have asked it before you began.

How did it come about that Nadija was a witness here? That is to say, did the government reach out to her? Did her daughter reach out to her? Who was the immediate agent, so to speak?

MR. BEATY: On the first meeting that the government had with Irma, she stated her mother would be returning to the U.S. in early January. At that point the government asked Irma to reach out to her mother to let her know that we'd like to speak with her when she was here.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Very good. Sorry to interrupt. THE COURT:

Not at all, your Honor. MR. BEATY:

If Irma and her mother simply wanted to take the children away to the Netherlands Irma could simply have left. Her mother doesn't have to come back to the U.S. for her to do that. Her mother doesn't have to testify here for her to do that. Irma has had passports for the kids for almost two months. She could just go. Michael Materasso is in jail for drug use. It doesn't matter whether this specification is proved up. He'll still be in jail. Ms. Nezirovic did not need to come to testify to keep him in jail, to the extent that that's even necessary for this sort of fantastical conspiracy Irma hasn't left and her mother did come here. to work. took the stand. And she told you what she saw.

The defense also suggests that perhaps Ms. Nezirovic is testifying vindictively because her son-in-law cheated on her daughter. This, too, isn't supported by the evidence. She testified that she's not angry at Michael Materasso. She's simply worried about her daughter. And the defendant testified that he's cheated on Irma a number of times. And why now? This isn't the first time that she -- that Ms. Nezirovic has heard about Michael's infidelity. This isn't the first time she observed Michael's abusive behavior.

Irma has largely been a single mother of two girls while the defendant has been in prison. So why all of a

1 sud

sudden, at this point in 2014 has Ms. Nezirovic decided to become a criminal and perjure herself? It doesn't make any sense.

Again, it doesn't make sense that Ms. Nezirovic would invent this particular story. It's not violent. It doesn't involve threats. It doesn't involve any abuse of the daughters. She could have come up with anything in the world. But instead she admitted a number of times that she had never seen the defendant hit Irma. She simply says she saw this strange but shocking and embarrassing tying-up-naked incident.

If Ms. Nezirovic is making up the whole story and rehearsed it with Irma in advance, why not embellish a little? And why not fix the holes? She could have testified that Jack was barking. Or correctly described where the dining room table is located.

Ultimately, your Honor, this case comes down to credibility of witnesses. I submit to you that Nadija

Nezirovic's testimony was more credible than the defendant's.

You know that the defendant lied to you about drugs. There is no reason to think that he isn't also lying about November 5.

The defense has not delivered on any evidence that Ms. Nezirovic is conspiring with Irma to kidnap the children by lying on the stand.

In sum, the evidence has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant unlawfully

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

restrained Irma Materasso on November 5, 2014.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

I'll hear now from defense counsel.

MS. GLAVIN: Your Honor, Mr. Materasso's parents, Donna and Michael, Sr. are outside and they asked me if they could be present for the summation.

> THE COURT: Sure.

MS. GLAVIN: Your Honor, I just want to start with the premise that even if you were to credit Nadija's testimony, it doesn't meet the preponderance of the evidence standard for unlawful imprisonment under New York law. Just starting with that premise. Because her testimony alone, there is no evidence that the tying up that she says happened or restraining was unlawful or without anybody's consent. So it's not -- even at the end of the government's case, which is why we move for directed verdict, we don't think it meets every element by a preponderance of the evidence.

But even if your Honor says okay, if I just heard from Nadija, that's enough. I want to hit the arguments that I think -- that I know you know are coming.

This case started, as you know, much broader. When your Honor signed the warrant for Mr. Materasso's arrest there were four specifications. Signed it on November 12. Mr. Materasso turned himself in to state custody. He was in state custody for a little more than a month.

2 | 0

December 16 was the first day he appeared in this courthouse. The D.A.'s Office let him out so that he could come and face your Honor.

Mr. Materasso appeared before a magistrate judge. The magistrate judge, if your Honor recalls, granted him bail. We had a telephone conference that evening on the 16th. Your Honor granted the government's stay until we could meet before the Court on the 18th. The 18th was the first time Mr. Materasso has seen you again since the last time.

When we were here on the 18th I think there were two important things that happened. First and foremost, he pled guilty immediately to specification No. 4. No hesitation. No ask for a continuance. I am guilty. He didn't plead to 1 to 3. And there was a reason for that and that's because he didn't do it.

So he pleads guilty immediately, right off the bat.

The second thing that happens that day, which is pretty important, is if we had any doubt about it, we learned that Irma Materasso is not a shrinking violet. Because your Honor had a letter that he had to put on the record that day,

December 4 letter that Irma Materasso sent to Probation Officer Olivares, which was then forwarded to the Court and put as part of the record. And in that letter Mrs. Materasso told the Court, told all of us, that: I left Michael on November 5, went to a DV is shelter with my daughters. The night before he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

tied me up naked to a chair and did a cavity search on me because he believed I was hiding his bag of drugs. He was up for five days. He got extremely paranoid and still went to work like that. He's lucky he didn't kill some innocent labor worker while operating a heavy machine, while being up for five days on crystal meth.

Irma Materasso was pretty angry. And Irma Materasso didn't want Michael out of the state system. And then when we got to this courtroom she didn't want him out of here. She got her whole family involved. She was getting her family involved before then. So, what happens next as this case proceeds along the docket?

As your Honor knows, the defense began issuing a lot of subpoenas. The government hadn't spoken to Nadija Nezirovic until within the last couple weeks is the first time. They had spoken with Irma. And Irma had already locked herself into a story because her story is in a written police report in a statement that she signed. Her story formed the basis --

MR. BEATY: Objection, your Honor. None of this is in evidence.

THE COURT: Well to the extent what is implicitly being asked is that the Court take judicial notice of other proceedings, that part is unexceptionable.

The question of whether I can take judicial notice of what of a statement that was made by Irma in another court

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

seems to me a much closer question. I will allow it for now but -- but I would also point out the obvious. Both sides chose not to call Irma. At an absolute minimum that suggests that neither side felt that her evidence or her admissions or whatever either side might have gained from her taking the stand outweigh the negatives of calling her, the strategic negatives.

So, if the government had felt that the benefits of her firsthand knowledge outweighed the baggage that she obviously brings, they could, if they chose, have called her. They could have all sorts of strategic motives for not calling her, the most obvious being that they had a witness who they thought was credible and didn't have any of this baggage who they decided to call.

The defense had similar dilemmas, if you will. could have called her and spent, I'm sure, hours bringing out all the baggage as well as the possible inconsistencies of the sort of thing that counsel is now alluding to. But they felt that that was outweighed by whatever benefits the government would obtain from having the defense call her to the stand, or whatever. I don't -- it's not for me to speculate.

MS. GLAVIN: There's another possibility too.

THE COURT: But the point is this. Putting aside the technical question of whether I can take judicial notice of what you're now getting into, I don't think either side -- and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this goes to both sides -- can have their penny and their cake. If you didn't call her, then what does it matter whether she gave inconsistent testimony in another court or not?

MS. GLAVIN: It's that, your Honor, she didn't mention anything -- if this scene happened as Nadija described it on the morning of the 5th.

THE COURT: If you're saying I should take notice of what she said so that I can -- because it contradicts what her mother said, that would be totally impermissible since you didn't call her.

MS. GLAVIN: Right.

THE COURT: So I'm still missing now what you're getting at.

MS. GLAVIN: What I'm getting at is negative. If Nadija Nezirovic had actually witnessed this happening, Irma Materasso has a big mouth. She didn't have any problem writing you, going off, calling him a psychopath. Irma Materasso through this incident doesn't talk to her mother. Her mother says that she comes out of that bedroom and she -- she did change her story overnight. As your Honor specifically asked her on day one of her testimony: When you came out were you looking straight ahead and see this or did you have to turn and look to your right? And she told you unequivocally straight That was the last question for the day. ahead.

THE COURT: I understand the arguments about that but

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't see what that has to do with the immediate question, which is what Irma said in a statement entered in state court that was not part of the evidence in this case that you now want me to in effect take judicial notice of.

MS. GLAVIN: Simply the fact that Irma Materasso, her not being a shrinking violet, shows that What Nadija Nezirovic is describing happened on the morning of the 5th, she looks to her daughter and says, you know, what's going on, or what's the matter, and her daughter doesn't say anything? Her daughter is not yelling? She's being tied up naked against her will and being restrained?

THE COURT: So the argument -- now I understand the argument. The argument is not what she said in that statement but the fact that she's happy to describe this incident to the world, specifically to the probation officer, to the state, but at the time of the incident she doesn't tell her mother about it. I think that is an argument that can be made regardless of -- I don't think that requires me to take judicial notice of what was in the statement but just of the fact that she filed a charge. So I will, to that limited extent, permit the argument.

MS. GLAVIN: That's an important point here, your Honor. Because, number one, Irma Materasso, when we started this, you saw the motion practice. It was pretty spirited. And the case became narrower, narrower, and narrower, to where

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the government had no case because they only -- if they didn't call Nadija. And when did they become aware and start figuring this out about Nadija, I don't know. But for the very first time after we briefed -- did briefing before your Honor, it was January 14, two days later, after we submitted exhibits, extensive exhibits, that the government says we've decided it's in the interests of the family not to call her. In the interests of the family, that's why we're not calling her. They suddenly came to that conclusion. And it's in their letter on the 14th. I would urge you to read it carefully. I think I read it about six times. But no admission that we're not calling her because of her baggage. That says something.

So as we come into this hearing, your Honor, a couple of I think sort of larger points. Number one, we had no burden to call anybody. It's all the government's burden. government ran away from Irma. Not the defense.

And another option that your Honor could consider about why the defense didn't call Irma is because the defense is pretty comfortable that we didn't need to call Irma because they didn't prove the case.

Now, in terms of the hearing. There's three points I want to make about Nadija's testimony. The first is her -it's the story about that morning of November 5. Because her story on day one was different than her story on day two, after she got home, spends overnight with her daughter.

I think, your Honor, it is pretty clear that the government had never gone through with Nadija in any detail the specifics of what happened. Who was standing where? What part of the apartment? She was totally and utterly unprepared on cross-examination for that. And so she began flailing about on day one as to where things were, which is why we had to lock her down in Defendant's Exhibit 33A as to what she saw and where people were standing when she opened the door to that bedroom. And she wrote down on 33A one thing. Where the dog was, where Michael was, where Irma was. And her handwriting is unmistakable that it was right there, right in front of her. And then she went home.

Damn. Now I know why Ms. Glavin was going through all that. This doesn't make sense. She came back that night.

Goes to show how far that mother would go. She took two photos and she drew her own floor plan which I submit to you is not an accurate floor plan but she drew a floor plan to make it consistent with the testimony she knew she had already given and was locked in.

Donna Materasso had never seen that floor plan before and I don't think she knew who drafted it except there was some foreign language on it. This is Court Exhibit D. She said no, this is not -- this is too short. This is not how this is shaped.

She comes back next day. She takes the photos. And

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the devil, your Honor, is in the details. It's always in the details when you're lying, which is why we went into incredible detail.

She lied -- the whole event never happened. This is a woman who testifies that Michael was too embarrassed to come back to the apartment. Remember, there was this fight when Nadija got there. And Michael wasn't at the apartment. And Irma's: Go away Michael, go away Michael. And puts all this stuff up against the door so he can't get in. And then Irma says to her mother Michael's embarrassed about coming back.

He's embarrassed about coming back but he's not embarrassed about tying her up naked in the morning next to his mother-in-law's room?

This is a guy who is embarrassed enough such that he's changing his clothes in the bathroom when his mother-in-law is there in the morning, early on before he goes to work, whereas normally he goes out into the living room, has his work clothes there and he changes right there. This guy wasn't going to do that in front of Nadija, the woman whom he had paid for the plane ticket for her to come there. No way.

So what we then see, the devil in the details. Remember on day one of her testimony Nadija said, I kept asking her, pushing her: Well what did the table look like? It had a tablecloth on it.

There was no tablecloth on that table the last time

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Michael Materasso was in that apartment, which was in November of 2014. He hasn't been back to that apartment since at least November 12, 2014 and there was no tablecloth on that table.

But she told you on day one there was a tablecloth that day. Well, yeah, because she's living in that apartment right now and she took the picture last night and there was a new tablecloth.

The other thing that she didn't remember, she came back on day two, was she can't see directly to the right. The dining room -- where the set-up is for the dining chair, you walk out of that bedroom. There is a hutch right there. It's in the photographs that she took. You can't look from that bedroom to where the dining area is and where the dining room table is.

Then let's talk about the tying up and the specific That's one of the dining chairs. I'm quessing it's probably one of the chairs that's in Court Exhibit C. But you got -- I mean we all saw Irma Materasso, okay. You can take judicial notice. You're just -- if you're going to tie her up to a chair, okay. You're going to tie her up like this? Where you could just stand up? This makes no sense. You're going to tie her like this to do a body cavity search? No. it's -- Michael Materasso does a lot of things. He didn't do that. And if he did that he would have done that a lot better.

The second issue, and the story just didn't make

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sense, and I've got to say you know for Nadija Nezirovic, she would do anything for her daughter. You could see that. those e-mails from the 17th, and the back and the forth. There's a desperation there. She's also not being honest with Donna Materasso. The part about Donna -- Irma sold everything she had, including her TVs. The TVs are in the photo. I mean come on. Come on, Nadija. She lied for her daughter.

And your Honor, you know, when Mr. Beaty said she'd come in here and commit perjury. She doesn't even know what this is. She thinks we're in some Child Protective Services proceeding. Her daughter, with all the things her daughter has done, her daughter has never spent a day in jail. She doesn't think you can do anything, quite honestly. And I think that's a fair inference. I think she thinks that her testimony here, nothing bad can happen to her. She goes on her merry way. She's been through a lot worse. She was through the Bosnian War. But in her mind, this wasn't that big a deal. Taking the oath here in the child protective -- she doesn't even know what these guys do.

Added to this is -- I mean thank God the defense subpoenaed Irma for all of her communications with her mother, which were produced by Mr. Cecutti on Monday. If we hadn't done that -- and it was a last minute call, but if we hadn't done that she wouldn't have been exposed for the precise lie that there is. Both she and her daughter. And it was an easy

one.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Why couldn't she just say it and it wouldn't have mattered? If she had just said, yeah, she drafted it for me. Nadija read it to me. I was fine with it. I sent it a long. It wouldn't have been a big deal.

But they knew there was a problem with that. It's so clear that she and her daughter were talking about that from yesterday to today about what's going on.

We haven't talked about it, it's not part of the record, but I would submit that the e-mail that was sent to us this morning from Mr. Cecutti sort of proves the whole point. They just -- Michael Materasso has got to live with the choices he made and the family that he married into. And he accepts responsibility for those choices. Because I've been scratching my head as to how he got himself into all of this thing, and who his wife is, and who his mother-in-law is. But I think what you heard here today is -- the last few days. There was a lot -- there was an incredible amount of truth. There was an incredible amount of truth, and there was extreme unhappiness. Irma is a drug user. So is Michael. Michael was using while he was out. He admitted that. And for the government to say he admitted what he couldn't deny, denied what he couldn't admit. I love that phrase. I used to use it all the time when The problem is he admitted things he could I sat over there. have denied. That's how you knew he was telling the truth.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You would never have known in September he had used crystal meth. He didn't have to tell you, as embarrassing as it was, that he went to all these spas and was getting sexual acts performed on him. Many times. And that's a crime. And it's a crime to commit adultery in New York. That also subjects him to a violation. He was happy to explain exactly what happened with the chair that he kicked. And it's really interesting, because the way Irma told everyone, they all believe he threw it. No. He kicked it.

He had no problem telling the Court that he knows 50 ways to Sunday what works and what doesn't work to get -- to pass a drug test. And he went through it. He's already talked to Olivares about the sweat patch. Yeah, I used it, this is how I did it. And there was one thing you can really believe about Michael Materasso, he was telling you the truth when he told you, no, it doesn't work. Stays in your body for five to eight days. I've tried everything. He has. He knows he has. If there's something he's an expert on, it's drugs, drug testing, how to beat it. And when he tells you or he tells me: No, it doesn't work, you can't dilute it. Doesn't work. You're going to get caught. I've already tried that. I've been there, done that.

The fact that Nadija Nezirovic walks out. She's there for two or three weeks. The morning she's leaving, the morning she's leaving is the morning Michael picks to tie his wife up

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

naked in the living room? She's there on the 4th. Michael freely admitted there was an argument on the 4th. He gave you the specifics as to who slept where on the bed. He went to work on the 4th. He took a drug test on the 4th. On the 5th he got up. 5:15ish. Sometimes hits snooze. Then 5:30. Puts the body pillow next to Gia so she doesn't roll off the bed. As he remembered it, when he went to bed on the 4th Irma was still mad at him because he had been cheating on her, even though he was denying it that night. As he remembered it, she was sleeping outside the bedroom. When he woke up in the morning, she was there. He didn't even know she had come into the bed. He got up to do his job that it's a miracle he even has a job given what's been going on for the last six years.

He gets up to go to work. Yeah, that morning he's embarrassed because he knows Nadija knows. And what's going on in the background, in terms of her motive to lie -- her motive to lie isn't just because she hates Michael. She's not a fan of his. And quite frankly if I were Nadija I wouldn't be a fan of yours either. But anyway, it's bigger than that. Irma has so much going on at that point and in those three weeks when the mother-in-law is there. Irma -- the stress of what's going on where she disappears for a few hours one day, where the government knows and it's part of a judicial record here in the Southern District of New York where she was on October 23. There's a lot on her mind and she's desperate.

And to find out now that her husband has been cheating on her repeatedly. If he leaves her -- she's not a U.S. citizen. What could happen with the FBI? What could happen with Child Services? There's an open investigation.

Everything is very, very complicated. And it's not easy. But if Michael is going out and getting it some place else as opposed to being at home in a happy marriage, and it might be that this time Michael leaves, because when is he's home there, she's doing drugs and, as he put it, he did it too. And it's a cycle. He's going to end up right back here.

She got furious. She couldn't take it anymore. She's told everybody under the sun a hundred different stories about Michael. Her mother believes all of it. And it ends up in e-mails that she blindly sends.

There is no other reason -- I mean it was like -- I got to tell you, you did a much better job on cross than I did because it was painful, and I realized your method was more effective than mine, to do it calmer, because it was painful to watch her try to explain why it is her daughter sent her that e-mail. And she was not going to go down, Judge. She was going to lie to the death. And she didn't think that there was a consequence in this courtroom, because we're just Child Protective Services here, and we can't do anything. We can't even take kids away. Which I want to add to that, this woman is a social worker for 20 years and she doesn't think Child

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Protective Services can take kids away? And just the fact that Irma is hysterical throughout the month of December, and is repeatedly and obsessively e-mailing Donna Materasso about all of her fears. And somehow Nadija isn't told? Oh I'm afraid Child Protective Services may take the kids away.

So, you walk out. You see your daughter tied up naked by your son-in-law. You don't say anything. She doesn't say anything. You go back into your room. You sleep for half an hour. Then a little while later you get up. You make some coffee. Then you wait for your daughter to come out. I think she said it was about an hour-and-a-half before she spoke to her daughter, the shrinking violet. And then take Jack the Pit Bull, who has been very quiet and dutiful throughout this whole horrible incident, to the groomer so he's ready to go to Holland. It's not there.

I want to talk a little bit about Michael's testimony and I want to talk a little bit about what I know Michael was like from this Court.

As you can probably guess from all the activity in the motion papers, and then the back and forth of whose been in and out of this courtroom the last month. This has been a pretty horrible month for everybody involved. Both families. Michael taking the stand was actually never a doubt. And he knew that he was going to be in a lot more trouble if he just didn't give up and give you the whole truth. He also knew that admitting

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

drug use could get him into more trouble with you. Very embarrassed. Didn't want to admit about the massage parts. And your Honor pushed him on it. Well, what else did you get? Well, I got other stuff. And then he told you.

It's important to him that nobody ever think for five seconds that he laid a hand on his wife in anger. Because he never did. And he will admit what he did. And he, believe me, he has admitted things that he didn't have to. And he did it because it's the truth.

I think if you just compare how he answered questions and even how his mom answered questions, compare that to the way Nadija and Irma answered questions. Because I would submit to you that Irma and Nadija answered questions the way criminal defendants or cooperators answer questions. Michael and Donna answered questions that you asked them. Weren't going off and giving you speeches. You asked me a yes or no. You got a yes or no.

What Michael said on the stand does expose him -- it actually exposes him to criminal liability. But I just think it speaks volumes. He has asked me. He would like your verdict today and he'd like to be sentenced today. I told him it's unlikely, but I would mention it.

This has been -- he's been for two months, two-and-a-half months. He didn't do this. He'll tell you all the things he did do. But he's not going to get up here and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

lie to you and say something that he didn't do. We don't think the government met it by a preponderance. The sheer number of exhibits the defense had to put in, I think we put in more evidence than the government. We don't think they've met it and we're asking you to find him not quilty on specifications one to three.

THE COURT: Before we hear from the government on rebuttal, just with reference to the last point. I'm not going to render a verdict today because I think I need to carefully review the evidence and including the arguments of counsel. But Mr. Materasso, is quite right, given that he is in limbo awaiting a sentence on the earlier -- the other specification that he's admitted to, he's entitled to a prompt sentence. I will give you my verdict no later than a week from today. And we will then set a prompt sentencing date after you've received the verdict through a telephone conference call to set that date. So it may be that I will give you a bottomline to be followed by a fuller opinion. But for sure you will at least get the bottomline by a week from today.

Let me hear from the government on rebuttal.

MR. BEATY: Your Honor, a lot of what Ms. Glavin said focused on what Irma had said and done. That's not in evidence. The letter that she sent to the Court is not in Irma wasn't here. Prior inconsistent statements evidence. that she may or may not have made are not relevant. The only

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

evidence that matters is whether Ms. Nezirovic is lying. And the only evidence that the defense has put forward to suggest that she is lying is this e-mail and this layout, the floor plan issue at the apartment.

With the e-mail there is no evidence that that's a lie at all. Her story was consistent. She said the first day that her son had helped her write it. That was corroborated by Irma's testimony. It was corroborated by the e-mail that Mr. Cecutti sent that Ms. Glavin referred to.

Her explanation has been consistent and importantly there is no reason for her to lie about that e-mail. e-mail itself is unimportant. There are no accusations in it. It's just a plea to Donna Materasso to help her daughter out financially. No reason for her to lie.

With respect to the layout, she explained from the beginning, she said she wasn't very good with maps. expressed confusion about what represented the door on the layout or on the floor plan. And, again, it's not -- there is no serious dispute that she's been at the apartment and that she knows where the dining room table, in fact, is.

With respect to this story that the defense thinks that Ms. Nezirovic made up. If she made this up, she could have done a lot better. She knows that Irma's not a shrinking violet. So she could have made up a story about how Irma reacted, about how she was screaming, about how she had to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

comfort her all day. If Irma and Ms. Nezirovic were in the apartment alone together later that morning, she could have said anything. But what she told you was she had coffee. They took the dog to the groomer. Those things suggest that she's telling the truth, not that she made it up.

Finally, the defendant's testimony. He has denied and denied everything until he had literally no choice but to admit it. He admitted that he went to these massage parlors because that went to the defense theory that Irma was upset about adultery. But he -- when he was asked about threats, he said that the only time that he had ever threatened Irma, that is threatened to kill Irma and make it look like an accident was one time in a series of text messages that he knew the government had because it had been put into evidence against him before. Other than that, had never threatened Irma.

On the stand he did lie about his drug use. About his cocaine use again, and again until he was confronted with proof.

Finally, the defense has raised the issue about consent, suggested that even if Ms. Nezirovic's testimony is true, maybe Irma had consented to being tied up. There is no evidence of that at all. You know that the defendant has threatened her in the past. There is evidence that she was afraid of him. She was blockading him out of the apartment. You know they had a fight, many arguments over the course of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ms. Nezirovic's visit. And they had a fight either the night before or several days before. And under those circumstances it doesn't make sense that she would consent to be tied up naked.

Importantly, she went to a domestic violence shelter after this incident. That's not the behavior of someone who has consented to being tied up naked.

Your Honor, I submit that the government has proven its case by a preponderance of the evidence. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Well I thank both counsel for excellent arguments and indeed for very excellent presentations throughout this quite interesting hearing.

I'm going to ask counsel before you leave this courtroom today to collect the originals of the exhibits, one of each, including the court exhibits and give them to my law clerk or my courtroom deputy so we will keep them while I'm working on the decision and then give them back to respective counsel. We will give them back we'll ask the government to hold the court exhibits as well.

In terms of the transcript I take it no one was ordering daily copy or were you?

MR. BEATY: We were.

THE COURT: So then I should be able to get the transcript. It should be here somewhere. I'll get it from the court reporter.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All right. Anything else we need to take up now? MS. GLAVIN: There's one housekeeping matter, your Honor.

Over the course of two days we were discussing Defendant's Exhibit 65. The first day that we were discussing Defendant's Exhibit 65 was a copy that my firm had done and there was a line on it.

THE COURT: You've explained that.

MS. GLAVIN: Then the second day.

So I think -- the one without the line on it should be 65A just so the record is clear.

THE COURT: That's fine.

No one chose to offer -- I was a little surprised, the e-mail letter that we got from Mr. Cecutti last night. But I'm willing to -- if both sides want, I'm willing to include that in the evidence. If either side objects I won't include it in the evidence.

MS. GLAVIN: No, your Honor. We would ask that it be included as part of the record.

MR. BEATY: We have no objection.

THE COURT: So we'll mark that as Court Exhibit E and why don't you mark one of the copies you have when you give --I want you to give my law clerk a complete set so she has in one place a complete set of all of the exhibits and work with counsel for the defense to do that rather than our trying to

Case 1:06-cr-00150-JSR Document 161 Filed 02/02/15 Page 53 of 54

F1N9MATH Summation - Mr. Beaty put together what we've got in bits and pieces. Very good. Thanks so much. (Adjourned)

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION
2	Examination of: Page
3	NADIJA NEZIROVIC
4	Cross By Ms. Glavin
5	Redirect By Mr. Beaty
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	